



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 16, 2003

Mr. Mark G. Mann
Assistant City Attorney
City of Garland
P.O. Box 469002
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2003-7384

Dear Mr. Mann:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 189551.

The City of Garland (the "city") received a request to inspect information pertaining to the arrest of a named individual on a specified date. You claim that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes an arrest warrant and supporting affidavit. The 78th Legislature recently amended article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to add language providing:

The arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, *is public information*, and beginning immediately when the warrant is executed the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the warrant and the affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours. A person may request the clerk to provide copies of the warrant and affidavit on payment of the cost of providing the copies.

Act of May 31, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 390, § 1, Tex. Sess. Laws Serv. 1631 (to be codified as amendment to Code Crim. Proc. art. 15.26) (emphasis added). Thus, the warrant

and supporting affidavit are public under article 15.26. Although you assert that information in these documents is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.130, the exceptions found in the Public Information Act do not apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Decision No. 525 (1989) (statutory predecessor). Therefore, you must release unredacted copies of the warrant and supporting affidavit to the requestor.

We turn now to your arguments regarding the remaining information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses information made confidential by judicial decisions. Texas courts have long recognized the informer’s privilege. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). It protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which a governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988). The privilege excepts an informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer’s identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer’s privilege.

In this instance, the submitted documents characterize the individual at issue as a “witness,” and you do not otherwise explain that this individual made the initial report of the suspected violation of law. We therefore conclude that the informer’s privilege does not protect this individual’s identity, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

You argue that other information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. This section provides in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation or prosecution of crime; [or]

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that *did not* result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (2) (emphasis added). Generally speaking, subsection 552.108(a)(1) is mutually exclusive of subsection 552.108(a)(2). Subsection 552.108(a)(1) protects information that pertains to a specific pending criminal investigation or prosecution. In contrast, subsection 552.108(a)(2) protects information that relates to a concluded criminal investigation or prosecution that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication.

You state that the information you seek to withhold under section 552.108 relates to a pending criminal prosecution. Based on your representation and our review of the information you wish to withhold, we conclude that the release of this information “would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1); *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases); Open Records Decision No. 216 at 3 (1978). Therefore, pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1), you may withhold the information you have highlighted in yellow. Because our ruling on this issue is dispositive of this information, we need not consider your other arguments.

In summary, the department must release unredacted copies of the arrest warrant and supporting affidavit. The information you have highlighted in yellow may be withheld pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1). The remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the

governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Karen E. Hattaway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KEH/lmt

Ref: ID# 189551

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Fred Slice
2406 Diamond Oaks
Dallas, Texas 75044
(w/o enclosures)